

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 19, 20, 31, 34 and 37-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 19, 20, 39 and 41 have been amended and claims 9-18, 21-30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 have been canceled by a previous amendment. Claims 1, 19, 20, 39 and 41 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Interview with Examiner

An interview was conducted with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application on June 5, 2009. Applicants greatly appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner during the interview. In the interview with the Examiner, it was pointed out that Applicants filed a suspension of action along with the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) on March 11, 2009. Therefore, the Office Action mailed on May 28, 2009 was sent in error.

The Examiner agreed that the Office Action was sent in error, and suggested that Applicants respond to the Office Action. The Examiner would consider the amendment and if a further rejection was to be forthcoming, such rejection would be a non-final Office Action.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1, 8, 19, 20, 31, 34, 39 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Todd et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,639,010 with Baker, U.S. Patent No. 5,364,011 as intrinsic evidence for non-contact dispenser. Claims 1-8, 19, 20, 31, 34 and 37-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cutting et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,638,597 in view of Shiba et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,714,195. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As the Examiner will note, the claims have been amended to further define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the add-on jetting is “predetermined.” In other words, the add-on

jetting is determined prior to the screen printing. Support for these amendments can be found at least from page 8, line 17 of the present specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references relied on by the Examiner teach or suggest this aspect of the present invention.

With regard to the Todd et al. reference, this reference is silent with regard to the step of "determining the predetermined additional amounts and predetermined positions prior to screen printing" as recited in claim 1. The Baker reference is also silent with regard to this aspect of the present invention and therefore fails to make up for this deficiency of Todd et al.

With regard to the Cutting et al. reference, this reference is also silent with regard to the step of "determining the predetermined additional amounts and predetermined positions prior to screen printing" as recited in claim 1. The Shiba et al. reference is also silent with regard to this aspect of the present invention and therefore fails to make up for this deficiency of Cutting et al. Furthermore, Shiba et al. discloses a device for making a color filter for an LCD (Liquid Crystal Display). Specifically, a bubble jet device is used for repair of defective color pixels. Shiba et al. is not directed to surface mount technology and therefore, there are no components mounted on the substrate in Shiba et al. In view of this, although the Shiba et al. reference is not relevant to the present invention and Cutting et al., which are directed to surface mount technology. In view of this, the Examiner's modification of Cutting et al. is improper and should be withdrawn. One having ordinary skill in the art would not look to Shiba et al. for the solution to any problem experienced in the Cutting et al. device. In other words, Shiba et al. is non-analogous prior art.

It should also be mentioned that Shiba et al. includes an inspection device that inspects the substrate in order to determine if correction is deemed to be necessary. As illustrated in FIG. 1 of the present invention; however, the amount and position of the additional viscous medium is determined prior to the screen printing. In this way, although it is possible to include an inspection device between the screen printer and the add on jetting device, it is not necessary to include such an inspection device. This is because the present invention is not only applicable to

the situation where the add on jetting device is used as a correction device. As described in the present specification, the presently claimed invention is also applicable to a situation where certain portions of the screen printed substrate can be applied much more efficiently with a jetting device and therefore the amount and position of the additional viscous medium is predetermined, i.e. known prior to screen printing on the substrate. This “predetermined” aspect of the present invention is described at page 8, second full paragraph of the present application.

Independent claims 19, 20, 39 and 41 also recite that the add-on jetting is “predetermined” in a similar manner to independent claim 1. Therefore, these claims are allowable for the same reasons mentioned above with regard to independent claim 1.

With regard to dependent claims 2-8, 31, 34, 37, 38, 40 and 42-44, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable due to their respective dependence on independent claims 1, 19, 20, 39 and 41, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-8, 19, 20, 31, 34 and 37-44 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Application No. 09/901,592
Amendment dated June 5, 2009
Reply to Office Action dated May 28, 2009

Docket No.: 0104-0354P

Page 11 of 11

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **June 5, 2009**

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Paul C. Lewis
Registration No.: 43,368
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant